## February 13, 2003

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor

FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Specialist III

RE: 2002 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Andalex Resources, Inc., Centennial

Project, C/007/019-WQ02-2

- 1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES [X] NO []
- 2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year re-sampling of baseline water data.

See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the Five Year Baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement

## Resampling due date 09/04/2006

The MRP commits to sampling baseline water parameters one year prior to the renewal date.

The next renewal submittal is due 09/04/2006, for renewal on 04/04/2007.

- 3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES [X] NO [ ]
- 4. Were irregularities found in the data? YES [X] NO[]

Of 14 required monitoring sites, twelve (12) sites (4 springs, 9 streams, 1 well) demonstrated 'No Flow'; leaving only two sites submitted for lab analysis (Well #1 and Spring B351).

YES[] NO[X]

]

From September 1998 through March 2002, the water level in Well #1 had steadily dropped from a depth of 60-feet to 74-feet, respectively. This condition showed signs of stabilizing this quarter with recovery to a depth of 72.1-feet. This site will continue to be monitored.

5.	Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?			
		1 <sup>st</sup> month,	YES [X]	NO [
		2 <sup>nd</sup> month,	YES [X]	NO [
		3 <sup>rd</sup> month,	YES [X]	NO [
6.	Were all required DMR parameters reported?	YES [X	] NO [	]
	DMR sites UT0040008 001 through 004 were reviewed; no discharge was reported at all sites.			

All sites were dry so no parameters were submitted.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

No further action is necessary for the 2002 2nd Quarter Water Monitoring data.

O:\007019.CEN\Water Quality\WQ 02-2.doc